



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/768,323	01/24/2001	David Meiri	07072-127001	3938

26161 7590 07/26/2005

FISH & RICHARDSON PC  
P.O. BOX 1022  
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022

EXAMINER

BURGESS, BARBARA N

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2157

DATE MAILED: 07/26/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

09/768,323

**Applicant(s)**

MEIRI, DAVID

**Examiner**

Barbara N. Burgess

**Art Unit**

2157

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 April 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### DETAILED ACTION

This Office Action is in response to amendment filed April 27, 2005. Claims 1-9 are presented for further examination.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kingsbury et al. (hereinafter "King", US 2003/00061395 A1) in view of Creswell et al. (hereinafter "Creswell", US Patent No. 6,775,690 B1).

As per claim 1, King discloses a method for posting a message on a message list accessible to a plurality of processors, said method comprising:

- Selecting a new-message slot (paragraphs [0029, 0032, 0034]);
- Placing said message in said new-message slot (paragraphs [0034, 0044]).

King does not explicitly disclose:

- Modifying said new-message slot to specify an intended recipient of said message, said intended recipient being selected from said plurality of processors.

However, Creswell discloses storing a message in a message store (message slot). This storage area also has a list of alternate recipients of the message (column 4, lines 58-65).

Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to implement or incorporate Creswell's specifying an intended recipient of message in King's method in order for time-dependent messages to be accessed by recipients.

As per claim 2, King discloses the method of claim 1 further comprising inserting said new-message slot into said message list, said message list including a first existing-message slot having a pointer to a second existing-message slot (paragraphs [0034-0036]).

As per claim 3, King further discloses the method of claim 2 wherein inserting said new-message slot into said message list comprises setting a first pointer on said new-message slot to point to said first existing-message slot and a second pointer on said new-message slot to point to said second existing message-slot (paragraphs [0046-0047]).

As per claim 4, King discloses the method of claim 3 wherein inserting said new-message slot into said message list further comprises setting said pointer associated

with said first existing-message slot to point to said new-message slot (paragraph [0047]).

As per claim 5, King discloses the method of claim 1.

King does not explicitly disclose wherein modifying said new-message slot to specify an intended recipient comprises modifying a destination mask associated with said new-message slot, said destination mask including information specifying all intended recipients of said message.

However, Creswell discloses storing a message in a message store (message slot).

This storage area also has a list of alternate recipients of the message (column 4, lines 58-65).

Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to implement or incorporate Creswell's specifying an intended recipient of message in King's method in order for time-dependent messages to be accessed by recipients.

As per claim 6, King further discloses the method of claim 5.

King does not explicitly disclose wherein modifying said destination mask comprises:

- Selecting, from a plurality of constituent data-elements of said destination mask, each of said constituent data-elements corresponding to one of said processors from said plurality of processors, a selected data-element corresponding to a selected processor;

- Modifying said selected data-element to indicate that said selected processor is an intended recipient.

However, Creswell discloses storing a message in a message store (message slot).

This storage area also has a list of alternate recipients of the message (column 4, lines 58-65).

Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to implement or incorporate Creswell's specifying an intended recipient of message in King's method in order for time-dependent messages to be accessed by recipients.

As per claim 7, King discloses the method of claim 1 further comprising updating a message directory to indicate the presence of said new-message slot in said message list, said message directory being accessible to said plurality of processors (paragraphs [0034, 0046-0047, 0051]).

As per claim 8, King discloses the method of claim 7 wherein updating said message directory comprises updating an attention mask containing information indicative of which processors from said plurality of processors are intended recipients of messages contained in said message list (paragraphs [0042, 0045]).

As per claim 9, King the method of claim 7 wherein updating said attention mask comprises:

- Selecting from a plurality of constituent data-elements of said attention mask, each of said constituent data-elements corresponding to one of said processors from said plurality of processors, a selected data-element corresponding to a selected processor (paragraphs [0041, 0044]);
- Modifying said selected data-element to indicate existence of a new message for which said selected processor is an intended recipient (paragraphs [0045-0047]).

### ***Response to Arguments***

**The Office notes the following arguments:**

- (a) Kingsbury message slots lack a field that identifies an intended recipient.

**In response to:**

- (a) Applicant's argument has been considered but is moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Conclusion***


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Barbara N. Burgess whose telephone number is (571) 272-3996. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:00am-4:00pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (571) 272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Barbara N Burgess  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2157

July 22, 2005

  
ARIO ETIENNE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100